



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

defense. *Contra, Connolly v. Bolster*, 187 Mass. 266, 72 N. E. 981; *Cushman v. Carbondale Fuel Co.*, 122 Ia. 656, 98 N. W. 509.

**ILLEGAL CONTRACTS — CONTRACTS COLLATERALLY RELATED TO SOMETHING ILLEGAL OR IMMORAL — RECOVERY OF PROCEEDS OF ILLEGAL TRANSACTION IN HANDS OF AGENT.** — The plaintiff sent goods to the defendant, his agent, with an illegal gambling device by which the goods were to be sold. It was agreed that the proceeds should be kept separate and remitted to the plaintiff, and that title in all the property should remain in the plaintiff. *Held*, that the plaintiff can recover the proceeds of the illegal sales. *Yale Jewelry Co. v. Joyner*, 75 S. E. 993 (N. C.).

The law will not aid in enforcing an illegal contract. Therefore the defendant in the principal case cannot be forced to perform his contractual obligation to remit the proceeds. *Snell v. Dwight*, 120 Mass. 9. If the illegal transaction were completed and the proceeds handed to an agent who did not participate in the transaction, the agent could not set up the illegality of the former transaction because the obligation to pay over to the principal would arise solely from the receipt of the proceeds. *Daniels v. Barry*, 22 Ind. 207; *Wilson v. Owen*, 30 Mich. 474. Many courts have held that where an agency or partnership is for the purpose of carrying out an illegal transaction the principal or partner cannot recover the proceeds, because the relation, being inseparable from the illegal contract, is itself illegal. *Lemon v. Grosskopf*, 22 Wis. 447; *Leonard v. Poole*, 114 N. Y. 371. The opposing view is that there is a duty arising from the fiduciary relation quite disconnected from the completed illegal transaction. *Truant v. Elliott*, 1 B. & P. 3; *Baldwin v. Potter*, 46 Vt. 402. See *Woodworth v. Bennett*, 43 N. Y. 273, 276. But this view would be hard to support if the transaction were a serious crime. If the title to goods and proceeds, however, is always in the principal, the plaintiff need rest his claim neither on contractual nor relational obligation, and it would not seem that the existence of illegality is ever a ground for allowing third parties to deprive the plaintiff of property, as distinguished from contract, rights.

**INJUNCTIONS — ACTS RESTRAINED — RESTRAINING SUIT IN A FOREIGN JURISDICTION.** — The defendant brought suit in an Iowa court against the plaintiff for slander and malicious prosecution, and while that action was still pending the defendant sued the plaintiff on the same cause of action in Missouri and attached land of the plaintiff in that state. A preliminary injunction restraining the prosecution of the Missouri suit was granted, whereupon the defendant, after causing the Iowa suit to be dismissed, moved that the injunction be dissolved. *Held*, that the motion should be granted. *Jones v. Hughes*, 137 N. W. 1023 (Ia.). See NOTES, p. 347.

**INTERSTATE COMMERCE — CONTROL BY CONGRESS — DISTRIBUTION OF RECOVERY UNDER EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT.** — A brakeman was killed through the negligence of the railroad while engaged in interstate commerce. A state statute specifying the persons entitled to recover damages in such a case conflicted with the federal Employers' Liability Act. *Held*, that the federal act governs. *St. Louis, San Francisco, & Texas Ry. Co. v. Geer*, 149 S. W. 1178 (Tex., Ct. Civ. App.).

For a criticism of a recent contrary decision, see 25 HARV. L. REV. 565. For a general discussion on the constitutionality of the federal act, see 25 HARV. L. REV. 548.

**INTERSTATE COMMERCE — CONTROL BY CONGRESS — EMPLOYEES PROTECTED BY FEDERAL EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT.** — A brakeman was injured